arXiv:1510.01671v13 [cs.FL] 9 Jan 2016

Cross-boundary Behavioral Reprogrammability Reveals Evidence of Pervasive Turing Universality*

Jürgen Riedel†
Institut für Physik, Universität Oldenburg, Germany; and
Algorithmic Nature Group, LABORES, Paris, France.

Hector Zenil‡
Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, UK;
Unit of Computational Medicine, SciLifeLab, Department of Medicine Solna, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden; and
Algorithmic Nature Group, LABORES, Paris, France.

Abstract

We consider the problem of finding a reasonable framework to ask the question of estimating the density of Turing universality and the reprogramming capabilities of random computer programs. By means of a natural enumeration and based upon the concept of *intrinsic universality*, we provide strong evidence of ubiquitous Turing-universality under a compiler space based on rescaling computation and coarse-graining emulation. We show a series of boundary crossing results, including instances of emulation (in all cases for all initial conditions) of Wolfram Class 2 Elementary Cellular Automata (ECA) by Class 1 ECA, Classes 2 and 3 ECA emulating classes 1, 2 and 3, and Class 3 ECA emulating Classes 1, 2 and 3, along with results of a similar type for general CA (neighborhood $r = 3/2$), including Class 1 CA emulating Classes 2 and 3, Classes 3 and 4 emulating all other classes (1, 2, 3 and 4). We also found that there is no possible hacking strategy with which to compress the search space based on compiler complexity or compiler similarity.

Keywords: coarse graining computing; rescaling; cellular automata; intrinsic universality; sensitivity; computer simulation; reprogrammability; causality; Turing-universality; controllability.

PACS Numbers: 05.45.-a

*Both authors contributed equally. JR and HZ conceived the project, wrote the code, analyzed the data, and wrote the paper. Code available online at `https://github.com/algorithmicnature/reprogrammingcapabilitiesofCAs`.

†jurgen.riedel@labores.eu

‡hector.zenil@algorithmicnaturelab.org

1 Introduction

The concept of *computational universality* is the most important concept in computer science, yet because proofs of universality are very difficult to produce, little is known about the incidence of computational universality among random computer programs, and possible answers to this kind of question depend on the choice of enumeration. Here we undertake a systematic and exhaustive investigation of the reprogramming capabilities of computer programs of fixed and growing sizes under sets of initial conditions that allow the computer programs to behave like other computer programs (hence as effective compilers).

While it is known that questions about general properties of computer programs are not only uncomputable but also not invariant to the choice of enumeration [7], interesting questions and answers arise for natural enumerations. For example, it is known that if one considers all possible programs of increasing size, most of them will either halt quickly or never halt [7, 2] and this has been confirmed numerically [9, 34]. Here we explore a related but different question concerning the *reprogrammability* of programs that may halt or never halt for specific (empty) inputs but that may operate under a restricted domain of possible initial conditions. By constraining the domain of possible initial conditions for a program to operate, such that every initial condition allows the computer program to behave like another program under a transformation (an effective compiler), we then ask how many other computer programs the said computer program can emulate. The question is evidently at the heart of the seminal concept of Turing universality.

We study the behavioral and programmability capabilities of the Cartesian product $P \times C$, where P is the set of all possible computer programs of fixed size and C the space of all possible compilers of growing size such that $p \in P$ emulates $p' in P$ with $|p'| = |p|$ under a coarse-graining transformation. We think it is natural (and more relevant in practice) to consider the asymptotic density of a set by considering the limit of the proportion of programs of fixed size n with the property in question (reprogrammability/intrinsic universality) as n tends to infinity, in order to avoid the trivializing effects of arbitrarily rearranged (computable) enumerations. We find that if C is the (semi-computable) set of initial conditions and $c \in C$ a compiler of size m, the sets of emulating A and emulable B computer programs (via cellular automata) have asymptotic density 1 for growing and fixed program size n and increasing compiler size (initial condition) m. Thus the number of computer programs that can be reprogrammed is of density 1, suggesting a phenomenon of pervasive intrinsic universality.

Time complexity results related to the type of emulation reported here may apply only to the chosen model of computation, given the parallel computing capabilities of cellular automata. However, without loss of generality regarding intrinsic universality, Turing-universality and the reprogramming capabilities of computer programs, we explore the rule space of cellular automata (CA), which is known to be a Turing-complete [13, 24, 1] model of computation. As any

cellular automaton can be simulated by a 1-dimensional cellular automaton, we only consider 1-dimensional CA [3]. However, for every cellular automaton of size n, there is a Turing machine proportional to n that computes the same function [24, 1, 30], so the phenomenon of pervasive reprogrammability and universality holds, independently of formal model, for fixed or increasing n.

The chief advantage of using cellular automata (CA) as models of computer programs is that they reveal their behavior in a very visual fashion, in ways that equivalent programs such as Turing machines do not due to their sequential nature, making cellular automata transparent to immediate visual inspection and understanding.

While it has been shown that small variations of the model description of CAs can effectively and qualitatively modify their behavior (e.g. [14], by enriching cells with *memory*), for example, here we found a wide reprogrammability range of computing capabilities without changing the model description, but simply modifying the set of allowed possible inputs. In other words, we effectively reprogrammed a computer program by finding a *compiler/translator* that mapped the unrestricted initial condition domain of a CA to a restricted one. Hence, by manipulating initial conditions, we show that even the simplest programs are able to emulate the most complex ones, mediated only by specific choices of initial conditions. By a single initial interaction we effectively reprogram a computer program to behave like any other program.

2 Methods

Definition 2.1. A *cellular automaton* (CA) is a tuple $\langle S, (\mathbb{L}, +), T, f \rangle$ with a set S of states, a lattice $\mathbb{L}$ with a binary operation $+$, a neighborhood template T, and a local rule f.

The *set of states* S is a finite set with elements s taken from a finite alphabet $\sum$ with at least two elements. It is common to take an alphabet composed of all integers modulo s: $\sum = \mathbb{Z}_s = \{0, ..., s-1\}$. An element of the lattice $i \in \mathbb{L}$ is called a cell. The lattice $\mathbb{L}$ can have D dimensions and can be either infinite or finite with cyclic boundary conditions.

Definition 2.2. The *neighborhood template* $T = \langle \eta_1, ..., \eta_m \rangle$ is a sequence of $\mathbb{L}$. In particular, the neighborhood of cell i is given by adding the cell i to each element of the template T: $T = \langle i + \eta_1, ..., i + \eta_m \rangle$. Each cell i of the CA is in a particular state $c[i] \in S$. A *configuration* of the CA is a function $c : \mathbb{L} \to S$. The *set of all possible configurations* of the CA is defined as $S_{\mathbb{L}}$. [16]

The *evolution of the CA* occurs in discrete time steps $t = 0, 1, 2, ..., n$. The transition from a configuration c_t at time t to the configuration $c_{(t+1)}$ at time $t + 1$ is induced by applying the local rule f. The local rule is to be taken as a function $f : S^{|T|} \to S$ which maps the states of the neighborhood cells of time step t in the neighborhood template T to cell states of the configuration at time step $t + 1$:

$$c_{t+1}[i] = f\left(c_t[i+\eta_1], ..., c_t[i+\eta_m]\right) \quad (1)$$

The general transition from configuration to configuration is called the *global map* and is defined as: $F : S^{\mathbb{L}} \to S^{\mathbb{L}}$.

In the following we will consider only 1-dimensional (1-D) CAs. The lattice can be either finite, i.e., $\mathbb{Z}_N$, having the length N, or infinite, $\mathbb{Z}$. In the 1-D case it is common to introduce the *radius* of the neighborhood template which can be written as $\langle -r, -r+1, ..., r-1, r\rangle$ and has length $2r+1$ cells. With a given radius r the local rule is a function $f : \mathbb{Z}_{|S|}^{|S|^{(2r+1)}} \to \mathbb{Z}_{|S|}$ with $\mathbb{Z}_{|S|}^{|S|^{(2r+1)}}$ rules. Three cases of 1-D CAs will be studied further in this paper. We study CAs which have states taken from the set $\mathbb{Z}_2$ and have different ranges. We have CAs with range $r = 1/2$, which have the neighborhood template $\langle 0, 1\rangle$, meaning that the neighborhood comprises the center cell and one cell to the right. We will call these *Primitive Cellular Automata* (PCA, also called *oneway* CA). We have the so called *Elementary Cellular Automata (ECA)* with radius $r = 1$ (closest neighbors), having the neighborhood template $\langle -1, 0, 1\rangle$, meaning that the neighborhood is comprised of a central cell, one cell to the left and one to the right. We also have what we will call *General Cellular Automata* (GCA), with radius $r = 3/2$, i.e., they have the neighborhood template $\langle -1, 0, 1, 2\rangle$, meaning that the neighborhood is comprised of the central cell, one cell to the left and two to the right. The rule space for PCAs contains $2^{2^2} = 16$ rules, the rule space for ECAs contains $2^{2^3} = 256$ rules, and the GCA rule space contains $2^{2^4} = 65\,536$ rules. Here we only consider non-equivalent rules subject to the operations complementation, reflection, conjugation and joint transformation (reflection and conjugation together) (see Sup. Mat.). For example, the number of reduced rules for ECA is 88. By increasing the range r or the number of states $|S|$ the cardinality of the rule space is increased dramatically.

Definition 2.3. A cellular automaton at time step t $A = (a(t), \{S_A\}, f_A)$ is composed of a lattice $a(t)$ of cells that can each assume a value from a finite alphabet S_A. A single cell is referenced as $a_n(t)$. The update rule f_A for each time step is defined as $f_A : \{S^{2^{2r+1}}\} \to \{S_A\}$ with $a_n(t+1) = f_A[a_{n-1}(t), a_n(t), a_{n+1}(t)]$. The entire lattice gets updated through the operation $f_A a(t)$. [15]

2.1 Block emulation and intrinsic universality

The notion of computational universality used for cellular automata was an adaptation of classical Turing-universality [13]. A stronger notion called *intrinsic universality* was later proposed (see [20, 21]).

Definition 2.4. A CA is intrinsically universal if it is able to simulate any other CA [20].

The exploration of the computing capabilities of CA by *block emulation* is a related mechanism by which the scale of space-time diagrams are decomposed

into causally disconnected 'light cones' and then coarse-grained according to an encoding/compiler establishing the emulation of a rule by some other rule under such a translation.

Definition 2.5. (emulation/simulation): Let A and B be two cellular automata. Then A emulates/simulates B if there exists a rescaling projection (what we also call a compiler or sometimes a back transformation) P of A such that $f_A^P = f_B$.

Notice that the transformation under the compiler is independent of initial conditions, and the emulation is therefore an emulation for every possible initial condition, i.e. a true full system (CA) emulation. This is because CAs are decomposed into independent causally disconnected 'light cones' (see Subfig. d in Fig. 2) the size of which is determined by the CA neighborhood (which determines the width) and the length of the compiler (which determines the depth). Not all decompositions are mutually exclusive. If they were it would mean that the emulated CA is not in the same rule space but in a larger one (which makes for an interesting question in its own right–the nature and number of emulations that are not in the same rule space and whether they indicate anything about the emulators). In other words, emulation is not closed under coarse-graining transformation.

Definition 2.6. A cellular automaton A is intrinsically universal if, for each cellular automaton B, there exists a rescaling/projection P of A (given by the reverse transformation of the block emulation) such that $f_A^T = f_B$.

Intrinsic universality is strictly stronger than Turing-universality; the former implies the latter. For example, intrinsic universality requires P-completeness, i.e. a system is intrinsically universal if it simulates all others in polynomial time. While ECA rule 110 is Turing-universal [6, 30], no ECA is known to be intrinsically universal, including rule 110 [20]. To prove that a particular 1-dimensional cellular automaton is intrinsically universal (and therefore Turing-universal), it is sufficient to prove that it can simulate any other 1-dimensional cellular automaton [3].

Our emulations are related to an even stronger form of intrinsic universality, namely *linear-time intrinsic universality*, meaning that all emulations only carry a linear overhead as the result of our brute force approximation in the exploration of the compiler and rule spaces.

One can try out different possible compilers/encodings and see what type of CAs these encodings are able to emulate (see Sup. Mat. for more details). It would be highly interesting to find encodings/compilers which would allow one CA to emulate another which has been proven to be universal, but it would also be interesting to find CAs with large reprogrammability capabilities that are not known to be universal but that can simulate other CAs that are qualitatively very different, thereby making them too natural candidates for intrinsic universality and Turing-universality. Even though this is impossible to do exhaustively, given that there is an infinite number of possible encodings/compilers

for any CA, one can make an assumption of uniformity and derive conclusions from statistical behavior.

Here we define a *linear* block transformation [28, 27], i.e., a scheme where the original CA $A = (a(t), SA, f_A)$ is emulated by a CA $B = (b(t), SB, f_B)$ through the lattice transformation $b_k = P(a_{Nk}, a_{Nk+1}, \ldots, a_{Nk+N-1})$. The projection function $P : \{SA\} \to \{SA\}^N$ projects a single cell of the initial condition of CA A to a block of N cells, which we call a 'block'. P_a denotes the block-wise application of P on the entire lattice a.

More generally, one can consider a block transformation P of block size T acting on an initial condition and then running rule f_A for Tt time steps. This emulates rule f_B. In fact, taking only every T time step of the result of running f_A for Tt time steps, one gets exactly the output one would if one were to run f_B for t time steps on the same initial condition.

In order for CA f_A and projection P to provide a successful emulation (we use 'simulation' interchangeably with 'emulation') of CA f_B, they must satisfy the commutativity condition:

$$f_B^t a(0) = P^{-1} f_A^{Tt} P a(0) \tag{2}$$

The constant T is the time scale of the emulation. In other words, running rule f_A for T time steps with the block projected initial condition $a(0)$ and projecting the output back with P^{-1} is identical to running the emulated rule f_B for t time steps.

Fig. 2 demonstrates the emulation process for any initial condition. Here we start, without loss of generality, with the most simple initial condition, e.g. one black cell. By applying rule 94 we let the CA evolve for 10 steps (a). If, on the other hand, we apply the block transformation □ → □□ and ■ → ■■ (b) to the above initial condition, we get two black cells. If we then let the transformed initial condition evolve, also with rule 94 but now for 20 steps, we get the space-time diagram of a different CA (c). In this particular case it amounts to the same thing as ECA rule 90 taking one black cell as the initial condition and then evolving for 10 steps (g). To see this better, we take the boxed area of (c) and highlight every second step (e). Extracting these steps leads to the spacetime diagram given in (h). By applying the back transformation □□ → □ and ■■ → ■ (f) to (h) we get ECA rule 90, i.e. the boxed area in (g). The back transformation is the actual coarse-graining process after the compilers create their output for each emulation step.

In Fig. 2 (d) (top) we give an example of a shortest compiler (all compilers we found include the shortest possible compiler for emulating a specific CA), which allows ECA rule 94 to emulate ECA rule 90 by defining the projection $P =$ □ → □□, ■ → ■■. Each represents the encoding of all eight possible inputs of the compiler. The output comprises the bits for ECA rule 90. Each compilation displays a distinct pattern. In (e) we highlight two of the compiler components, effectively showing how the compiler translates cells from ECA rule 94 to ECA rule 90.

In Fig. 3 we demonstrate the coarse-graining in more detail for the same


start
choose CA rule
create all transformations for block size
CheckCandidateA()
CheckCandidateB()
CheckCandidateC()
CheckCanditate()
Create transformation tuples
Create transformation pairs
tuples
Take the set returned by function CanditateB() and insert k-tuples into CA and let evolve for k steps.
Form a set of output k-tuples and create transformation pairs by cross joining it with set returned by function
Perform with them a block transformation on the DeBruijn sequence and insert this as initial conditions into CA andlet evolve for k steps.
Insert all possible block k-tuples into the CA as initial conditions of a given rule and let the CAevolve for k steps.
Insert as initial conditions the compliment of the set returned by CheckCandidate in respect to all possible k-tuples into CA rule and let evolve for k steps. Check if output equals all transformtuples which were returned as candidates.
Insert as initial conditions the compliment of the union of sets returned by the functions CheckCandidateA and CheckCandidateB inrespect to all possible k-tuples into CA and let evolve for 2*k steps. Check if output equals the input and return matches.
candidates
candidates
candidates
candidates
candidates
transformation pairs
return valid pairs
loop
increment block size until set maximum block size reached
end

Figure 1: Flow diagram of the exploration of the program (rule) space and compiler spaces.

initial condition as in Fig. 2. We start with the space-time diagram of rule 94 (c) for the initial condition of one black cell as used in Fig. 2 and then block transform it with $\square \to \square\square$ and $\blacksquare \to \blacksquare\blacksquare$. Taking the compiler components (a) and identifying the encoding of all eight possible inputs of the compiler as supercells [15, **?**] one may understand the compiler to be a mapping of each supercell to one cell, either black or white (b). Combining this with (c) one can depict the necessarily overlapping supercells as 'scales' on the space-time of the block transformed CA (d). Simply by taking the coarse-grained cells we get the coarse-grained version of ECA rule 90.

Emulation is a common technique in proofs for Turing-universality. For example, ECA rule 110 [30, 6] was proven to be universal by finding a "compiler" to translate it into a cyclic tag system, another model of computation proven to be universal, which in turn was proven to be universal by finding a "compiler" to translate a post-classical (in this case a 2-)tag system [22]. Emulation by coarse-graining in cellular automata (see e.g. [23]) has led to a stronger definition of universality [19, 20, 21]. Using these techniques, we proceed by brute force in order to explore the compiler space and the reprogramming capabilities of computer programs in general.



Figure 2: Flow diagram of a CA emulation: Compiler (d) for rule 94 (a) to emulate rule 90 (c) for any initial condition (in the example only one is depicted, the simplest black cell). At the top are the rule icons (source code) of the 2 ECAs. (f) Block transformation (h) coarse-graining (g) final emulation computes rule 94.

2.2 Determining complexity classes

An heuristic method to classify the behavior of computer programs into four qualitatively different classes was introduced by Wolfram [30]. For ECA, we will use the original Wolfram classification.

For GCA and the general case other than ECA (unless otherwise specified), a candidate complexity class W of a cellular automaton CA can recursively be given by [33]:

Definition 2.7.

$$W(CA) = \lim_{i,t\to\infty} \max W(CA(i,t))$$

where $W(CA(i,t))$ is the maximum Wolfram class of CA reached across all inputs i (for an arbitrary enumeration) up to runtime t. It is therefore clear that $W(CA)$ is approachable from below. That is, if $W(CA(i,t)) = C_n$ and $W(CA(i',t')) = C'_n$, then CA belongs to class $C_{n\prime} < C_n$, where $n' < n$. W introduces a partition, given that a system s cannot belong to 2 different Wolfram classes at the limit. That is, $\bigcap_{n=1}^{4} C_n = \emptyset$ and $\sum_{n=1}^{4} |C_n| = |\bigcup_{n=1}^{4} C_n|$.



Figure 3: Visualizing CA coarse-graining: Space-time diagram of ECA rule 94 (c) for any initial condition (in the example only one is depicted, the simplest black cell) with compiler components (a) identified as supercells (b) which are coarse-grained (d) to yield the space-time diagram of ECA rule 90 (f).

Which does not mean one cannot misclassify a system for initial values i and t. $W(CA(i,t))$ can then be formalized by using a suitable complexity measure, for example, the Kolmogorov complexity $K(CA(i,t))$ for initial conditions i up to time t. Then one takes the maximum or tries to calculate a limit. In practice this is impossible because K is semi-computable, but a lossless compression algorithm implementing an efficient Entropy rate can be used as a sufficient test for non-randomness, and therefore a loose upper bound on K. Thresholds are then trained to divide W into candidate classes C_n with $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ motivated by Wolfram's original classes.

The measure, based on the change of the asymptotic size of the compressed evolutions for increasing i and t, is calculated by following an enumeration of i based on a Gray-code enumeration, as suggested in [32, 33], to establish a distance metric between initial configurations. The measure then gauges the resiliency or sensitivity of a system based on its initial conditions. The phase transition coefficient thus defined led to an interesting characterization and classification of systems, which when applied to elementary CA, yielded precisely Wolfram's four classes of system behavior (with the exception of one borderline case). The coefficient works by compressing the changes of the different evolutions through time, normalized by evolution space. It has been shown to be an interesting approach to CA behavioral classification questions [32, 33].

Definition 2.8.

$$NC(CA) = \frac{K(CA)}{t}$$

The criteria for classifying the asymptotic behavior of the space-time evolution of a computer program, particularly a cellular automaton, are as follows:

- Classes 1 and 2: The evolution of the system is highly compressible for any number of steps;
- Classes 3 and 4: The lengths of the compressed evolutions asymptotically converge to the lengths of the uncompressed evolutions.

The question of the asymptotic behavior of a cellular automaton is therefore the question of whether $\lim NC(CA(i,t))_{i,t\to\infty} = 1$, for complex behavior, or $\lim NC(CA(i,t))_{i,t\to\infty} = 0$, for simple behavior [33]. Here we will use NC together with Block entropy (see Sup. Mat.) to determine the class W of a cellular automaton. If $NC(CA) \to 1$, then $W(CA) = C_{3;4}$; otherwise $NC(s) \to 1$, then $W(CA) = C_{1;2}$. However, a numerical approximation of $NC(CA)$ is needed, which means evaluating $NC(CA(i,t))$ for a number of initial conditions i, following the Gray-code numbering scheme as suggested in [33], and for a number of time steps. We believe that the approach introduced in [33] provides a scalable formalization comparable to the original heuristic approach.

Here we use a combination of two (related) measures, on the one hand Block Entropy (see Sup. Mat.), also identified as the Shannon Entropy rate, and on the other, a formalization of Wolfram's classes based on average compression. Block Entropy or the Entropy rate of the space-time evolution of a CA is given by:

Definition 2.9.

$$H_N(CA) = \frac{CA_{\{N\}}(i,t)}{N}$$

where H_N is the traditional Shannon Entropy over $N \times N$ blocks after decomposition of the cellular automaton C after t steps for initial condition i. Then we look at the maximum value of $H_N(CA_{\{N\}})$ for all N blocks up to a certain length and set of initial conditions and time steps, which in combination with the average compression, determines the complexity of a CA for the given t and i, providing an indication of its candidate (Wolfram) class.

2.3 Coarse-graining/back transformation

In a dynamical system, coarse-graining is used to describe large scale structures in the evolution of a system. This process has been applied to CA before [19, 15]. In theory there are many ways one can define the coarse-graining of a dynamical system such as a CA. Here we follow a definition in [15].

Definition 2.10. A renormalization scheme is defined where the original CA f_A is coarse-grained by a lattice transformation $b_k = P(a_{Nk}, a_{Nk+1}, \ldots, a_{Nk+N-1})$. In this case the projection function $P : \{SA\}^N \to \{SB\}$ projects the value of a block of N cells (also called a "supercell" [19]) in CA f_A to a single cell in CA f_B.

The coarse-graining emulation of CA f_A by CA f_B with the Projection P only works if the following commutative condition is imposed:

$$f_B^t P a(0) = P f_A^{Tt} a(0) \tag{3}$$

One can now apply this description of coarse-graining to the block emulation procedure described above. Applying the projection P to (2) on both sides, one obtains

$$f_A^{Tt} P a(0) = P f_B^t a(0) \tag{4}$$

Note, CA f_A, CA f_B, and P are in principle different from the ones defined for (3). We can now compare (4) with (3) and ascertain that it describes the coarse-graining emulation of CA f_B by CA f_A with the Projection P. In other words, the block emulated CA f_B is a coarse-grained description of the CA f_A transformed with P, i.e., in fig 2 e.) is the coarse-grained description of the block transformed CA b.).

3 Results

3.1 An example of emulation in the PCA rulespace

We start with the PCA rule 13. By defining the projection $P = \square \rightarrow \square\blacksquare, \blacksquare \rightarrow \blacksquare\blacksquare$ to random initial conditions $a(0)$, i e. $a'(0) = Pa(0)$, rule 13 can be made to emulate rule 12. In this particular case the block size is 2 and it takes 2 time steps for rule 13 to emulate one lattice entry of rule 12. The lattice entry $a(Tt)$ is identical to the lattice entry of rule 12 at $a'(t)$ if one applies the back projection $P^{-1}a$.

3.2 Taming a class 4 ECA to behave like a class 2 ECA

If one applied the projection $P = \square \rightarrow \square\square\square\blacksquare\square\square, \blacksquare \rightarrow \square\blacksquare\square\square\square\blacksquare$ to random initial condition $a(0)$, rule 54 can be made to emulate rule 51 (see Fig. 4).

3.3 A Wolfram ECA class 3 rule, 45, emulating class 2 rule 15

Using projection $P = \square \rightarrow \blacksquare\blacksquare\blacksquare\blacksquare\square\square\blacksquare\square\square\blacksquare, \blacksquare \rightarrow \blacksquare\blacksquare\blacksquare\blacksquare\blacksquare\blacksquare\square\square\square\blacksquare$ to random initial condition $a(0)$, ECA rule 45 can be made to emulate ECA rule 15. Rule 45 emulates rule 15, which is a high heat CA being programmed to emulate a simple rule. This was not shown in [27]. In [30], rule 45 is shown to emulate rule 90 with a time shifted block emulation, which is different from the block emulation used in this paper. The actual block emulation process of rule 15 by rule 45 shows that rule 45 takes $T = 10$ steps in order to reproduce one line of rule 15.



Figure 4: Reprogramming class 4 ECA rule 54 (top) to compute a class 2 ECA, rule 51 (middle top), for any initial condition (here only one is depicted–for purposes of illustration–in the middle bottom, which is also the coarse-grained version of the evolution in the middle bottom). The smallest compiler (bottom) of size 7 found in the compiler space (up to size 15) has been used. The compiler only interacts with rule 54 at step $t = 0$ but not afterwards, i.e., from $t = 1$ on the computation is carried out by ECA rule 54 alone.

3.4 A Wolfram class 2 emulates a class 3 rule

Another example of emulation is the emulation of ECA 90 by ECA 164. In this case the projection is $P = 0 \to ■■■■, ■ \to ■□■□$. On applying the projection P to random initial condition $a(0)$ using rule 164 to evolve the lattice, one obtains as a result an emulation of rule 90. This is especially interesting since rule 164 is a class 2 ECA and rule 90 a class 3 ECA.

3.5 A Wolfram class 3 rule emulates a class 2 rule

Cellular automata in larger rule spaces (GCA) provide a set of interesting cross-boundary emulations over a much larger domain than ECAs and PCAs.

An example is the emulation of GCA rule 782 by GCA rule 4086. In this case the projection is $P = □ \to □□, ■ \to □■$. On applying the projection P to random initial condition $a(0)$ using rule 4086 to evolve the lattice, one obtains as a result an emulation of rule 782. Rule 4086 is more complex than rule 782, and the emulation is another example of a class emulating another, less complex one, which is very common.

Another example of a GCA rule emulating an apparently more complex rule is the emulation of GCA 4382 by GCA 17 910. In this case the projection is $P = \square \to \square\square, \blacksquare \to \blacksquare\square$. On applying the projection P to random initial condition $a(0)$ using rule 17 910 to evolve the lattice, one obtains as a result an emulation of rule 4382. Rule 4382 is more complex than rule 17 910. This is another example of a "jumper" rule, just like ECA rule 164.

3.6 A Wolfram class 3 rule emulates a class 1 rule

An example of a Wolfram class 1 GCA emulating a class 3 GCA is the emulation of GCA rule 27 030 by GCA rule 13 960. In this case the projection is $P = \square \to \square\blacksquare\square, \blacksquare \to \square\blacksquare\blacksquare$. On applying the projection P to random initial condition $a(0)$ using rule 13 960 to evolve the lattice, one obtains an emulation of rule 27 030. Rule 27 030 is more complex than rule 13 960, and the emulation is another example of one class emulating another, less complex one, which is very common.

Despite the disorganized nature of class 3 rules, they also display a wide range of reprogramming capabilities, being able to compute and behave in an orderly fashion, as, for example, class 2 or 4 rules. Fig. 14, shows how class 3 rules can be reprogrammed to emulate not only other class 3 rules but also class 4 rules. Hence they cannot be overlooked as candidates for Turing-universality on the grounds that they seem difficult to control, as this uncontrollability is only apparent.

3.7 A Wolfram class 1 rule emulates a class 3 rule

An example of a Wolfram class 1 emulating a Wolfram class 3 GCA is the emulation of GCA rule 6696 by GCA rule 27 030. In this case the projection is again $P = \square \to \square\square\blacksquare, \blacksquare \to \square\blacksquare\blacksquare$. Applying the projection P to random initial condition $a(0)$ using rule 6696 to evolve the lattice, one obtains an emulation of rule 27 030. Rule 6696 is much less complex than rule 13 960, and the emulation is an example of one class emulating another, more complex rule.

3.8 A Wolfram Class 4 rule emulates another class 4 rule

An example of an intra-class 4 emulation is the emulation of GCA 2966 by ECA 25 542. In this case the projection is $P = \square \to \square\square, \blacksquare \to \square\blacksquare$. Applying the projection P to random initial condition $a(0)$ using rule 2966 to evolve the lattice, one obtains an emulation of rule 25 542. This is interesting, since both rules 2966 and 25 542 are class 4 ECA rules.

3.9 Simulation time complexity

The depth of the "compiler" (or length of block encoding) provides the time complexity overhead of the simulation. For example, in Fig. 4, rule 54 requires 7 time steps to emulate every time step of rule 51, and the time complexity

overhead of the simulation with respect to the simulated is $O(n+7)$. This also means that the block transformation to obtain the actual computation of the simulated from the simulating rule has to take the coarse-grained version of the latter and every other 7 steps. In this way one can obtain the exact output of the simulated rule.



Figure 5: Cross-boundary *circos* plots showing emulating and emulated rules in different qualitative classes. Each square represents a complexity class. ECAs were classified according to their consensus Wolfram classes, while GCAs where classified by compressibility, taking 3 clusters based on the Euclidian distance of the compressibility index. ECA rules (Left) can emulate almost any other rule except class 4, which is isolated, but in GCA space (Right), all rule classes can be emulated by all other rules, though Low (L) rules cannot emulate High (H) rules. A table with specific examples is provided in the Sup. Mat. and the full list is available in CSV format at `https://github.com/algorithmicnature/reprogrammingcapabilitiesofCAs`.

3.10 Ubiquitous Turing-universality from intrinsic universality

While we consider how many times a rule is emulated a measure of its complexity– which is deeply related to its Kolmogorov complexity by way of algorithmic probability—we also consider how many other programs a given computer program can emulate up to a certain compiler size, treating this number as a measure indicating its likelihood of Turing-universality.

There are three conditions which if met point towards pervasive reprogrammability, which is evidence of ubiquitous intrinsic universality and hence of Turing-universality:

1. that the number of different non-trivial emulated rules per emulating rule increases (as a function of compiler length),
2. that the phenomenon replicates in larger rule spaces, and
3. that the emulations are not all of a particular (trivial) behavior.

The results reported here provide strong evidence on all counts, even if for item 2 only a relatively small set (despite being huge in absolute numbers) of computer program and compiler pairs can be explored.



Figure 6: Distributions of emulating and emulated GCA rules of varying complexity, showing that (1) emulating rules emulate non-trivial rules covering the full range of possible behaviors (emulating rules emulate all classes of complexity into which GCA were divided by compressibility and entropy) and (2) the more complex the rule the greater the programmability (there is a short compiler to carry the emulations).

On the one hand, among ECA almost all rules emulate at least one other rule, almost all of them emulate at least 2 Wolfram classes, and 3 rules (26, 94, 164) emulate 3 different Wolfram classes (see Table 1). It is worth noting that the number of native low complexity rules exponentially decays [33] and is therefore one of the reasons for the lack of emulation in the first panel. In other words, the fact that native high complexity rules dominate higher rule spaces strengthens the pervasive programmability and hence the pervasive universality hypothesis.

On the other hand, Fig. 6, shows that in GCA, almost all rules emulate at least one other complexity class, and that among high complexity rules there are around 500 multi-emulating rules (more than 3%) that emulate 2 different complexity classes. Figs. 7 show that among the emulators in ECA and GCA, each emulates on average (for all classes) a larger fraction of other rules as a function of compiler size. Plots for ECA and GCA for collapsed (only differently emulated) and non-collapsed cases (counting repetitions of emulations) show that all frequencies do increase in linear fashion.

Finally, Fig. 8 shows that the rule space together with the compiler space saturates the number of (non-trivial) emulations in the rule space, and that the larger the rule space the greater the number of emulating and emulated rules, thereby suggesting a path toward ubiquitous intrinsic universality and



Figure 7: Frequency counts for collapsed and non-collapsed cases. (x-axis block size and y-axis log average of emulation frequency per CA class (ECA for Wolfram classes and GCA divided into Low and High complexity). For the collapsed case (i.e. distinct frequencies not considering different encodings per block size) the data is not enough. However, for non-collapsed ECA and both collapsed and non-collapsed GCA, the average increase of non-trivial reprogrammability per rule is confirmed.

hence Turing-universal computation for even the smallest rule spaces and for the simplest rules, with the exception of the set of most trivial rules (e.g. rule 0 and rule 255 in ECA) that is shown to remain constant as a function of growing rule spaces and is therefore asymptotically negligible and effectively of size 0. Other rules, such as the linear ones, can be proven not to be intrinsically universal [20], yet they seem to remain low in number as compared to both the growing number of emulators and the growing number of emulating rules per emulator in larger spaces.

As seen in Fig. 8, almost all ECA rules are capable of being reprogrammed to behave like some other rule, showing the wide range of computing capabilities of the rule space up to the explored compiler size 15, with this range asymptotically showing 100% of the rules being able to emulate some other rule.

Most rules emulate more than one other rule and with more than one compiler. GCA rules continue generating emulating rules beyond compiler size 12. While the fraction of possible emulations is small when considering the huge rule + compiler pair combinatorial space (on y axis, right plot), the plot on the right provides statistical evidence that the number of emulations (including all compilers that emulate rules emulated previously) grows and that the larger the rule space (GCA) the faster the potential convergence. A more fine grained version of these results is shown in 9.



Figure 8: Asymptotic intrinsic universality and Turing universality. Accumulated rules that can be reprogrammed to behave like at least one other (non-trivial) rule in the same rule space with a compiler up to size 15 (ECA) and 12 (GCA). All class 3 and 4 emulating rules in ECA, that is, 9 rules representing almost 10% of the number of essential rules in ECA, are emulators of a rule not in class 1 or 2 in the same rule space and with even smaller compilers (hence the constant behavior). Non-trivial emulating GCAs of medium complexity grow asymptotically, just as in all other cases, strongly indicating reprogramming capabilities rapidly saturating every rule space, even for the smallest and simplest rule and compiler combinations (evidently trivial rules like ECA rule 0 and 255 will never be reprogrammed but they are effectively of size 0).

While almost all ECA rules emulate some other non-trivial ECA (including class 2 emulating class 3 rules), no class 4 ECA was emulated. However, among GCA, both medium high (equivalent to class 4) and lowest high complexity rules emulated all other rule complexity cases, including a class 1 emulating a class 3, a class 2 emulating class 3 and 4, a class 3 emulating 3 and 4, and class 4 emulating all others, including class 3 and other class 4 rules. i.e., all GCAs emulated all other complexity classes, except for class 1, which did not emulate class 4.

Rule	Native complexity class	Emulated classes
26	M	H,L,M
94	M	H,L,M
164	M	H,L,M

Table 1: There are 3 ECAs of medium compressibility (at least Wolfram class 2) that emulate more than 2 different complexity classes (all cases, low, medium and high uncompressibility). Likewise, in the CA space there are 781 emulators of at least one other CA in each of the 3 complexity classes (low, medium and high), 237 of them are of medium compressibility themselves, and 544 of high uncompressibility. Thus, the more complex the more likely they are to be able to emulate rules in different complexity classes.

As shown in Fig. 7, the reprogrammability phenomenon in the emulation space is not dominated by trivial emulation. Taken together, the results suggest that reprogramming capabilities increase for higher rule and compiler size, and that every rule in every rule space is effectively non-trivially reprogrammable. While the growth of the plot on the right could be driven by trivial emulations, e.g., emulations of rule 0, the plot on the left only counts each rule emulation once and cannot therefore be driven by trivial cases, in light of the fact that most rules actually eventually become of the highest complexity class according to the asymptotic behavior investigated in [33].

4 Conclusions

Because of the wide reprogrammability of computer programs, a negative reading of the results is a fundamental collapse of complexity classes (in agreement with asymptotic results reported in [33]). However, the number of simple rules not emulating other simple and complex rules is of measure 0 with respect to the rule/program space size (also determining the maximum program size), in contrast to those able to emulate other rules which saturate every rule/program space. Thus, while there are no essential differences separating classes by their computational capabilities (other than trivial versus the rest), the results suggest a definite answer to questions about fundamental classification schemes that attempt to provide information about the computing capabilities of the programs classified.

The results reported herein imply that if computer programs are taken as toy models of digital "universes", the initial conditions are as or more fundamental than the underlying rules or instructions. Rules in these computer programs can be seen as physical laws that cannot be broken, but as we have seen, even the simplest "physical laws" are able to emulate other "universes", including complex ones, disregarding their apparent behavior for otherwise simple or random initial conditions, thereby hiding much and revealing little of the nature of the laws or even the initial conditions. These are only revealed by the number of

compilers which a rule can use to behave in a particular, e.g. complex, fashion.

The results also suggest that the more complex a system the more sensitive it is to its initial conditions, thereby becoming fundamentally less predictable. That is, a discrete dynamic system whose trajectory has entered a more complex orbit has a greater degree of freedom to explore and becomes less controllable in the face of perturbations. However, the results also indicate that even the most complex and random-looking systems can be effectively and qualitatively reprogrammed. Indeed, the common belief was that CAs of Wolfram's class 3 were in some sense "too wild" (characterized by high entropy) to be controlled and made to perform useful computations (i.e., to be practically programmable), but we have shown that this is not the case in any fundamental sense. Furthermore, classes 1 and 2 that were believed to be of limited computational value turned out to be highly programmable too, able to carry out even the most complex qualitative computations, thereby strongly suggesting that even the simplest rules are strong candidates for Turing universality. The results shown bear out a generalized phenomenon of pervasive reprogrammability.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Stephen Wolfram, Todd Rowland, Jesper Tegnér, Matthew Szudzik, Jean-Paul Delahaye and Narsis A. Kiani for stimulating discussions and feedback.

References

[1] Albert, J. and Culik II, K., A simple universal cellular automaton and its one-way and totalistic version, *Complex Systems*, 1, pp 1–16, 1987.

[2] Calude, C.S. and Stay, M.A. Most programs stop quickly or never halt, *Advances in Applied Mathematics*, 40, 295–308, 2008.

[3] Durand-Lose, J., Intrinsic universality of a 1-dimensional reversible cellular automaton, STACS 97 (Lübeck), *LNCS*, vol. 1200, pp. 439–450, 1997.

[4] Boccara, N., Fuk's, H. Number-Conserving Cellular Automaton Rules, *Fundamenta Informaticae* 52, pp. 1–13, 2002.

[5] Chaitin, G.J. On the length of programs for computing finite binary sequences: Statistical considerations, *Journal of the ACM*, 16(1):145-159, 1969.

[6] Cook, M. Universality in Elementary Cellular Automata, *Complex Systems* 15: 1–40, 2004.

[7] Hamkins, J.D. and Miasnikov, A., The halting problem is decidable on a set of asymptotic probability one, *Notre Dame Journal of Formal Logic*, 47, pp. 515–524, 2006.

[8] Le Bruyn, L. and Van den Bergh. M. Algebraic properties of linear cellular automata, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 157, 217–234. 1991.

[9] Delahaye, J.-P. and Zenil, H., Numerical Evaluation of the Complexity of Short Strings: A Glance Into the Innermost Structure of Algorithmic Randomness, *Applied Mathematics and Computation*, 219, pp. 63-77, 2012.

[10] Levin, L. Laws of information conservation (non-growth) and aspects of the foundation of probability theory, *Problems in Form. Transmission*, 10. 206—210, 1974.

[11] Margenstern, M., Pavlotskaya, L. *Vers une nouvelle approche de luniversalité concernant les machines de Turing*, Tech. Rep. 95.58, LITP Institut Blaise Pascal, 1995.

[12] Margenstern, M., Pavlotskaya, L.: On the optimal number of instructions for universal Turing machines connected with a finite automaton, *International Journal of Algebra and Computation* 13(2), 133-202, 2003.

[13] von Neumann J., *Theory of self-reproducing automata*, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, Ill., Burks A.W. (ed), 1966.

[14] Martínez, G.J., Adamatzky, A. and Alonso-Sanz R. Designing Complex Dynamics in Cellular Automata with Memory, *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, vol. 23:10, 2013.

[15] Israel, N., Goldenfeld, N. Coarse-graining of cellular automata, emergence, and the predictability of complex systems, *Phys. Rev. E* 73, 026203, 2006.

[16] Powley, E.J. Global Properties of Cellular Automata. Tese (Doutorado), University of York, 2009.

[17] Kirchherr, W. Li, M. and Vitányi, P., The miraculous universal distribution, *Mathematical Intelligencer* vol. 19, pp. 7–15, 1997.

[18] Kolmogorov A.N. Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information, *Problems of Information and Transmission*, 1(1):1–7, 1965.

[19] Mazoyer J., Rapaport I., Inducing an order on cellular automata by a grouping operation, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, vol. 91(1–3), pp 177-196, 1999.

[20] Ollinger N., The quest for small universal cellular automata, *International Colloquium on Automata, languages and programming (ICALP'2002),* Widmayer P., Triguero F., Morales R, Hennessy M., Eidenbenz S. and Conejo R. (eds), *LNCS* 2380, pp. 318–329, 2002.

[21] Ollinger N., The intrinsic universality problem of one-dimensional cellular automata, *Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS'2003)*, Alt H. and Habib M. (eds), *LNCS* 2607, pp. 632–641, 2003.

[22] Post, E. Formal reductions of the combinatorial decision problem, *American Journal of Mathematics*, 65 (2), pp. 197–215, 1943.

[23] Rowland, T., Two-dimensional Totalistic Code 52, *Complex Systems*, 17, 163–182, 2007.

[24] Smith III, A.R. Simple computation universal cellular spaces, *Journal ACM*, 18, pp. 339–353, 1971.

[25] Solomonoff, R.J., A formal theory of inductive inference: Parts 1 and 2. *Information and Control*, 7:1–22 and 224–254, 1964.

[26] Wolfram, S., Universality and complexity in cellular automata, *Physica D*, 10 1–35, 1984.

[27] Wolfram, S., Table of Cellular Automaton Properties, *Theory and Applications of Cellular Automata*, World Scientific, pp. 485–557, 1986.

[28] Wolfram, S., Statistical Mechanics of Cellular Automata, Review of Modern Physics, 55, 601–644, 1983.

[29] Wolfram, S. *Cellular Automata and Complexity*, Addison-Wesley, 1994.

[30] Wolfram, S. *A New Kind of Science*, Wolfram Science, Chicago, Il., 2002.

[31] Wolfram, S.; Martin, O.; and Odlyzko, A. M. Algebraic Properties of Cellular Automata, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 93, 219–258, 1984.

[32] Zenil, H. Compression-based Investigation of the Dynamical Properties of Cellular Automata and Other Systems, *Complex Systems*, 19(1), pages 1–28, 2010.

[33] Zenil, H. and Villarreal-Zapata, E., Asymptotic Behaviour and Ratios of Complexity in Cellular Automata Rule Spaces, *International Journal of Bifurcation and Chaos*, vol. 13, no. 9, 2013.

[34] Zenil, H. From Computer Runtimes to the Length of Proofs: With an Algorithmic Probabilistic Application to Waiting Times in Automatic Theorem Proving. In Dinneen, M.J. Khousainov, B. and Nies, A. (eds.), *Computation, Physics and Beyond, International Workshop on Theoretical Computer Science*, WTCS 2012, LNCS 7160, pp. 223-240, Springer, 2012.

A Supplemental Material

A.1 Reducing a program (CA) rule space

Local rules define the dynamical behavior of CAs. However, not all rules show essentially different dynamical behavior. To focus on the number of rules in a rule space which show essentially different dynamical properties, one can introduce the following symmetry transformations:

Reflection:

$$f_r(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = f(x_n, ..., x_1, x_2) \tag{5}$$

Conjugation:

$$f_c(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = q - 1 - f(q - 1 - x_1, q - 1 - x_2, ..., q - 1 - x_n) \tag{6}$$

Joint transformation, i.e. conjugation and reflection:

$$f_c \circ f_r(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) = q - 1 - f(q - 1 - x_n, ..., q - 1 - x_1, q - 1 - x_2) \tag{7}$$

Under these transformations two CA rules are equivalent and they induce equivalence classes in the rule space. Taking from each equivalence class a single representative (by convention the one with the smallest rule number), one gets a set which contains essentially different rules, i.e., rules which show different global behavior.

Let $G(\chi(f_r), \chi(f_c), \chi(f_c r))$ be a group under the operation $\circ$ acting on a set X of all possible neighborhood templates. Using the orbit counting theorem one can state the following theorem:

$$\frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{g \in G} \chi(g) = \frac{\chi(f_I) + \chi(f_r) + \chi(f_c) + \chi(f_{cr})}{4} \tag{8}$$

with $\chi(g)$ being the number of elements of X fixed by g.

For the PCAs one finds:

$$\chi(g) = \frac{2^4 + 2^3 + 2^2 + 0}{4} = 7, \tag{9}$$

For the ECAs one finds:

$$\chi(g) = \frac{2^8 + 2^4 + 2^6 + 2^4}{4} = 88, \tag{10}$$

and for the GCAs one finds:

$$\chi(g) = \frac{2^{16} + 2^{10} + 2^8 + 0}{4} = 16\,704 \tag{11}$$

essentially different rules. We will therefore only subject these essentially different rules to analysis throughout the paper.

A.2 Linear Rules

A *linear* rule is defined by the additivity condition:

$$f_{abc}[x_{n-1}, x_n, ..., x_{n+1}] = ax_{n-1} \otimes bx_n \otimes cx_{n+1}, a, b, c \in \{0, 1\} \qquad (12)$$

If a CA rule satisfies the additivity condition (12), the factors a, b, c are integer constants 0 or 1. Linear rules are usually simple rules. However, there are linear rules which exhibit complex behavior, such as Wolfram class 3 rules. Looking at the different rule spaces one finds:

1. PCA rule space: There are 4 essentially different linear rules: (0, 3, 6, 10). Besides the trivial rule 0, rule 3 and 10 are Wolfram class 2 rules. The only complex rule is 6, which is a Wolfram class 3 rule.

2. ECA rule space: There are 8 essentially different linear ECA rules: (0, 15, 51, 60, 90, 105, 150, 170, 204). Rules 0 (a=b=c=0), 15 (right shift with toggle), 170 (left shift rule), and 204 (identity rule) are Wolfram class 2 rules. The rules 60,90,105 (sum rule with toggle), and 150 (sum rule) are Wolfram class 3 rules.

3. GCA rule space: There are 14 essentially different rules (0, 255, 3855, 4080, 13260, 15420, 15555, 21930, 23205, 27030, 38550, 39270, 43690, 52428). Rules 255, 3855, 43690, and 5242 are Wolfram class 2 rules. However, rules 4080, 13260, 15420, 15555, 21930, 23205, 27030, 38550, and 39270 are Wolfram class 3 rules.

   Linear CAs have the advantage that one can perform an algebraic analysis in order to determine certain of their global properties [31, 8]. We will refer to linear CAs throughout the paper in the context of their role in block emulation, and point out some of the special roles they play.

B Emulation by input translation

B.1 Block transformation

To find possible block transformation candidates for a given CA rule and block size k one can adopt the following algorithm:

1. For ECAs set the CA range to 1 and for GCAs set range to 3/2.

2. Given the block size one inserts all possible block k-tuples into the CA as initial conditions of a given rule and lets the CA evolve for k steps. Check whether output equals input. Return matches. This is implemented in function CandidateA[].

3. Insert as initial conditions the complement of the set returned by function CandidateA[] in respect to all possible k-tuples into CA rule and let evolve for k steps. Check whether output equals all transformed tuples which

were returned as candidates by function CandidateA[]. Return matches. This is implemented in function CandidateB[].

4. Insert as initial conditions the complement of the union of sets returned by the functions CandidatesA[] and CandidateB[] in respect to all possible k-tuples into CA, and let evolve for $2 \times k$ steps. Check whether output equals the input and return matches. This is implemented in function CandidateC[].

5. Use k-tuple pairs created from sets returned by functions CandidateA[] and CandidateC[] and with them perform a block transformation on the De Bruijn sequence. i.e. for ECA use {0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 1} and for GCA use {0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1}. Insert these as initial conditions into CA and let evolve for k steps. Check the output to ascertain that it contains all the input k-tuples. If so, return true, otherwise false. This is implemented in the function CheckCandidate[].

6. Take the set returned by function CandidateB[] and insert k-tuples into CA and let evolve for k steps. Form a set of output k-tuples and create transformation pairs by conjoining it with set returned by function CandidateB[], i.e. the input. First run the elements of the set returned by function CandidateB[] through the CA with given rule for k steps and combine the output with the input elements of set returned by function CandidateB[] to form pairs. Check to see if these pairs are real candidates by passing them through the function CheckCandidate[].

7. Collect all k-tuple pairs for which the output from the function CheckCandidate[] returns true. The resulting set contains valid block transformations for given rule and block size.

Steps 5 to 7 are implemented in the function Candidates[] written in the Wolfram Language and uploaded as a package of Wolfram Mathematica notebooks to GitHub (available at `https://github.com/algorithmicnature`).

For a set of CAs one can construct a directed graph (see Figs. 11, 13 and 13) of rule emulations by putting the rules (the emulating rule as well as the emulated rules) at the vertices and assigning the block transformations as edges connecting the vertices (rules). Hereby we set the direction of the edges to point from emulator rule to emulated rule.



(a) Low complexity ECA rules



(d) Low complexity GCA rules



(b) Medium complexity ECA rules



(e) Medium complexity GCA rules



(c) High complexity ECA rules



(f) High complexity GCA rules

Figure 9: Emulation frequency of high, medium, and low complexity ECA and GCA rules. The top three graphs (a)-(c) show the emulation frequency of ECA rules in relation to the emulation block size. Graph (a) shows how frequently high complexity ECAs (Wolfram classes 3 & 4) emulate other ECAs of high complexity, medium complexity (Wolfram class 2), and low complexity (Wolfram class 1). Similarly, graph (b) shows this for medium complexity ECAs and graph (c) for low complexity ECAs. Graphs (d) - (f) show the same for GCA rules.



Figure 10: Rule emulation network for ECA. Network constructed with block size up to 20 for Wolfram classes 1, 2, 3 and 4. Loops represent self-emulations with linear time overhead as a result of using compilers of respective block lengths. In reality this emulation network is thoroughly connected, because as we have shown, there are "jumper" rules that trespass class boundaries, i.e emulate a class other than their own, whether of higher or lower complexity. However, for clarity we have segmented the network, and "jumpers" are shown in a different color font than their native class color. For visualization purposes we only show a few interesting cases, with different maximum lengths for different classes. The color of the edges is determined by the number of emulations. The more emulations, the closer to red the edge color, the fewer possible emulations, the closer to blue (traditional heat spectrum colors). The thickness of the edge is inversely related to the minimum block length of the emulation. If the minimal block length is 2 the edge is maximally thick and decreases if the minimal block length increases. In addition, the minimal encoding block length is displayed at each edge. The rule numbers are color coded. The codes are: blue=class 4, red=class 3, green=class 2, and black=class 1. Hub nodes confirm that the attractors are mostly linear (also known as additive, see Sup. Mat.) CA rules.



Figure 11: Rule emulation graph of the PCA rule space for block emulators (compilers) up to size 10. Edge weights give the number of emulations; the color and the width are as in Fig. 10. In this emulation network no reduction to essential rules was performed, and it can be seen that the network reflects this by producing a symmetric graph.



(a) Class 4 emulations of class 4 rules

Figure 12: Rule emulation graph of GCA class 4 emulating class 4 rules.



(a) Class 4 emulations of class 3 rules

Figure 13: Rule emulation graph of GCA class 4 emulating class 3 rules.



Figure 14: Cross-boundary ECA and GCA rules. The grid shows cross-boundary ECA and GCA rule pairs (the top rule is the emulating rule, the bottom one is the emulated rule) for different Wolfram classes (rows are emulating and columns emulated rules). GCA show a wide range of reprogrammability, with almost every rule capable of being reprogrammed. Notable cases are classes 2 and 3, which are capable of emulating classes 3 and 4, with class 3 in fact being able to emulate any other class (from GCA on) up to the compiler space size explored. Hence all these classes can be reprogrammed to behave like any other computer program, displaying alternative qualitative behavior (complexity).